| | Λ | |
|---|----|--|
| | m | |
| | η. | |
| 3 | 11 | |
| | | |

| | | ' | vashington, D.C. 20231 | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICAN | T ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | | |
| | | | | | |
| 09/470,26 | 5 12/22/ | 99 ROBINSON | K EXAMBRES, 455US3 | | |
| 021186 MM71/0831 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402 | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER NGUYEN, C 13 DATE MAILED: | | | |
| Relow | lo a communicati | on from the EVASSINED In about a fall for | 2811 | | |
| Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS | | | | | |
| | | ADVISORY ACTION | | | |
| THE PERIOD F | OR RESPONSE: | | | | |
| a) 💢 is extended | to run | or continues to run Three month | from the date of the final minetics | | |
| b) expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection. | | | | | |
| Any extension The date on purposes of | on of time must be on which the response determining the per | obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.138 b, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the filed of extension and the corresponding | S(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. e date of the response and also the date for the | | |
| 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above. Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a). | | | | | |
| Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed | | | | | |
| 1. M The proposed amendments to the claim and /or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because: | | | | | |
| a. [X] There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented. | | | | | |
| b. They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note). | | | | | |
| c. They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note). | | | | | |
| d. They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. | | | | | |
| e. X They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: The | onew limit of new isse | ations in claus 19,20,79,8, bes that world require | 1 82, 84, 85, 104-106, 113,115 and 117) Luther consideration and or | | |
| 2. Newly propose the non-allow | sed or amended cla able claims. | ims would be allowed if su | bmitted in, a separately filed amendment cancelling | | |
| 3. Don the filing be as follows: | g an appeal, the pro | posed amendment D will be entered W wil | i not be entered and the status of the daims will | | |
| Claims allowed: | | | | | |
| Howe Applicant | • | rcome the following rejection(s): | • | | |
| | | r reconsideration has been considered but doe | s not overcome the rejection because | | |
| | | | | | |
| The affidavit or presented. | exhibit will not be o | considered because applicant has not shown go | ood and sufficent reasons why it was not earlier | | |
| ☐ The proposed draw | ing correction | has has not been approved by the exami | | | |
| Other | | | Primary Examiner | | |

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PTOL-303 (REV. 5-89)